

Méontologie As Discipline? [2019]

Name „méontologie“, which has since recently begun to appear in the world literature (mostly in completely different meanings), perhaps at least surprise, if he does not refuse. Like the more common term „ontology“, it was understood as name of a philosophical Discipline, so that it should (and could) examine „being as being“ (this interpretation dates from Aristotel, but who has the name ' ontology ' not yet enjoyed, even talking about „being such a science“ without naming it, we'll get back to it – First Philosophy), this strange new term should be understood as a sign for another (meaning Also Philosophical Vwhich by – perhaps – mčThe (a Perhaps mohThe) „Being the most“. This is, however, a formulation that must necessarily provoke its seeming anti-corruption: if it is, it seems to be without a problem, to examine it just as it is. But if I ,He eternally'As to therefore It was possible to examine them as ,nejsoucí'When the Yet He eternally? It is perhaps possible that something that is in addition to being (that is), Was is also not the most As Whenwould not be Also He eternally? And if it seems to be a good sense to examine the same as it is, what might be the point of examining it as being the most?

[From everyday experience, however, we know that many, perhaps most of them, are counting on their duration, Must With their lives. I once was interrupted by the dog of Our Lady Porter for a moment during the teaching lecture He penetrated through the open lower door to the large auditorium and led the attention of most students (if they had not slept); And then disappeared again, his mistress dismissed. And at that moment I thought to ask the students: what was that? And they said the dog. And so I continued: and was the dog all over? And they, with a little bit of a gasp: Understandably, was the whole!? And what do you consider? Well, he had a head, four legs, a tail, just a whole body! So I continued: and it was Here Also the puppy who The dog Once was? What about the last dog that barked in the morning before the faculty? And what's the old, deaf dog that will be? He was there, too? Students had More Fun, mostly laughing at what I was saying, but when ledL speak to this event, but few were able to reasonably interpret what I meant by all this. I mention it only to the evidence that speaking and thinking of some sort of thing is not so meaningless, if we duly realize that we must respect the difference between the dog who is here and now, and between the same dog who has lived here for many years and who When we think about it, in fact, it is always only at the moment, whereas, for most of its „living“ life, it is either no longer in existence (but was But Or is not yet a part of it (but will be the pTheahyne). So that we can put this differenceAlso linguistically, And this is certainly important for mutual understanding, We will talk in the first case about „the things“ (or we could revive – and Certainly přeznačit Old Czech word „jestota“) and, in the second case, on ' being '. While every currently present „state“ of „life“ (= celostného Duration) of a true being, we will be called his „coexistence“, the whole of his „Life“ (= full-time duration) will be called his „dwelling“. Therefore, no Whole Present at the same point, but only in their own Immediate „jsoucnostech“ (i. e. always in the same. But no „coexistence“ can be understood as the presence of the right in the whole, because it is in a sense mere „abstractum“, though not just thought.]

Each (not only right) is „shown“ only in its individual, but immediately passing, while the right is only „to appear“ in its fullness. The question remains, Whether and As it may „appear“ also untrue (e. g. a pile ofE. g. Pile of bricks, rock, Island etc.) It is possible to interpret it only in such a way that it is an entity (e. g. we) who „understand“ (= we grasp the mind) and we name the island as an island and not as something rather neforemného or indeterminate, what can change in its components in time, the latter mayožkAlso be exchanged without the possibility of finding something that would testify to their integrity or dependence on a plan (the fee of some plan). However, the grouping of a pile does not mean that the individual components are independent of each other; Of course some fundamental and the sheer The separation of the piles (even in the case of huge piles, e. g. star) and

various Does not exist, everything responds to itself (all with everything), but only within the limits of the reresponsiveness of individual components and subsložek. But this general reactability cannot yet establish the unification of any pile in its constituents. And so the big problem arises: what is it that is capable of using this general reprotibility – Selectively! – To create an integrated whole? And here we come to the absolute necessity of finding an approach and a way of thinking about something cannot be taken as a matter of fact, but Maybe just On the contrary, just as the factu and the non-subject matter „in general“.

Situation

a) Fillosofie is in crisis, it even talks about the end PhilosophyAnd also about, the time poevropské'); Everything that begins in history can also endT, either by falling out of history or by finding a new path, returning (by bankruptcy) or moving forward and higher. For Provided progress' In the case of philosophy, it may be another development ' (but historically developmental, not evolutionary) Phenomenon Stage, what has happened several times, or the termination of one line of thought and the start of another. This launch of something new has also been, and it is difficult to decide what change tom which case it is. Myth eg. Once arose (we do not yet watch, when and how), and in fact has not abated, even though it has already fallen forms; However, we certainly cannot understand the next stage of thinking as an evolution in the conceptual sense, but the conceptual concept undoubtedly has other sources. Nevertheless, we can quite well observe the mythical traditions ' influence on the conceptuality, what is only temporary in the conceptual thought, what even seemingly predominates on time, a Can Also Observe how the myth is declining and as if it is going, but at the same time how the conceptual is prevented and how it attempts to win the myth. This is why it is often difficult to decide if the Steps, Forward and higher, or just to compete, what will come up and what will temporarily retreat, so it can be a double „development“ side by side and against each other. Undoubtedly, the conceptness of thinking also has its „development“ and even the biggest changes and transformations Have Pojmovosti It may not be understood as its end, but as a refinement, improvement, deepening, etc. That is why, meanwhile, it is a matter of our approach and estimation, if we perceive the crisis of the thought in question more as a crisis of conceptual itself, or just as a crisis of the so-called. Metaphysics. And if we are to understand philosophy as metaphysics (i. e. , as inherently connected with metaphysics), we will self-crisis and krizovost Ascribe the philosophy itself. And then, however, we will interpret the origins of the non-subject thinking as the end of philosophy and as the beginning of a new stage, the post-philosophical era. But it will depend on how chápeme Or how we will interpret what philosophy is. In this case, many are not clear, and therefore, without embarrassment, they speak about the philosophy (and philosophies) of old India, old China, etc.

b) With all this and the reasoning of this kind relates, how will we interpret the first attempts to philosophy of non-subject matter and accept the name „méontologie“ As a carrier or at least as satisfactory. As evidenced by analogical phenomena in history, we can certainly not expect the new discipline to start, as if the past of the thought did not exist or as if it could simply not be ignored. The question also is whether we have méontologii Consider as a new (special) discipline whether this discipline is to replace ontology, or whether it is one of the major types of reconstruction, which, however, retains the basic structure (or outline) of ontology roughly the same. We certainly cannot count on the fact that the schedule can be méontologie Sketched out in a thorough, as this task will need to be approached again and again for decades, if not centuries. What we will do in this treatise is no „Foundation„But rather just a list of the most important ideas and principles that will have to be managed and controlled for some time. Méontologické Thinking Therefore, it cannot be fully started immediately, but only gradually step by step; We really have to start learning.

